



DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
FOR
RESOURCES & SYSTEMS

LOGGED
8 MAY 1982

Prod 12

DCI/IC 5383-82

29 April 1982 STAT

Memo For
Director, IC Staff STAT



Dr. Ruth Davis, who is on the DIA Advisory Committee, has provided the attached comments regarding the SAFE project. and I discussed it and agreed you should see a copy of the comments. STAT

As you are aware, many of the points she raises are being addressed in the on-going review of the project alternatives, but the paper provides several interesting perspectives. I have also talked with Harry Fitzwater about inviting Dr. Davis to join the SAFE Technical Advisory Board and he agrees.



1 encl a/s

STAT

DIA review completed.



DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301

U-113/AC

21 APR 1982

Lieutenant General James A. Williams, USA
Director
Defense Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.C. 20301

Dear Jim:

The CIA/DIA SAFE Program has recently been audited by a joint CIA/DIA Team as well as having been reviewed by a CIA Advisory Group. Both groups found the SAFE Program to be seriously flawed.

SAFE is important to DIA not only for its contribution to DIA's automated capabilities but also because it reflects DIA's ability to satisfactorily manage developments of automated information handling systems.

The progress and status of SAFE are also of considerable interest to the DCI, SecDef, the NSC and Congress. As a consequence, the remedial managerial actions taken by DIA in the immediate near term will be significant in the perceived credibility of DIA to manage other DoDIIS planning and operational functions.

The DoDIIS Panel of the DIA Advisory Committee would like to call to your attention the following observations and suggestions we have developed after hearing the results of the SAFE audit and an account of the CIA Advisory Group's review:

1. DIA should be a full partner in the decisions which must be made within the next few weeks. You should have a senior representative with your full support working with whatever managerial mechanism is set up by DCI to address SAFE issues. DIA participation in the past on policy issues has not appeared to be as a co-partner with CIA.

2. You should request an impact assessment from the DoDIIS office of the effect on DIA of the options under consideration for SAFE's continuation. These appear to include three from the audit team report, one from the CIA Advisory Group and several from Admiral Inman. You should have these impact assessments before having to make SAFE decisions, not after such decisions are made. One option which should be included is what realistically can be expected from a SAFE system within the current approved funding profile.

3. The panel has been told that contractor funds are being expended at the rate of slightly over [] and that none of these funds are being applied directly to the DIA components of SAFE (Blocks 3 and 4). You should not tolerate this imbalance of emphasis. The SAFE Project Office should direct the prime contractor [] to include in his ongoing efforts, parallel activities supporting both CIA and DIA. Experience has shown that if such parallel emphasis is not in place, the components of lower priority, i.e., DIA, never "make it" within the approved funding profile.

STAT

STAT

DIA review completed.

4. Admiral Inman has set up a four person advisory group to review the revised schedule and costing estimates requested of [redacted]. This group, all from the private sector, would appear to benefit from the addition of someone who could more specifically represent DoD, i.e., DIA's interest. We suggest you consider adding someone to the group with this end in mind. I would add personally that on 15 April I talked to [redacted] one of the members of the group, who highlighted the fact that Bobby Inman plans to retain this group as an ongoing advisory body for SAFE activities. This lends emphasis to the panel's recommendation to you on this point.

STAT

STAT

5. The panel believes that inadequate scheduling, costing, risk and benefit analyses, and priority information have been provided by or requested from the prime contractor [redacted]. We suggest that you ask the contractor to provide this management data matched to your revalidated DIA SAFE requirements. No decision on SAFE's future can properly be made by you or the DCI without this data in hand. DIA's internal revalidation of its SAFE requirements and priorities will provide a necessary template against which to judge the adequacy of proposed revisions to SAFE.

STAT

6. The composition and performance of the DIA SAFE Program Office should be assessed immediately in an effort to strengthen it or to make needed changes. The panel is strongly convinced that DIA's interests need to be taken more into account in SAFE scheduling than they have been to date.

The panel makes these suggestions and observations to you because it endorses the basic precepts which have led to the initiation of the SAFE program. It also encourages the continuation of the SAFE program as a joint DIA/CIA activity. At the same time the panel is concerned that the risks and uncertainties attendant to the SAFE program as currently being managed and implemented, may seriously erode the anticipated benefits. Accordingly, we urge your attention to this report.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

STAT

for

RUTH M. DAVIS
Chairman,
AC DoDIIS Panel